

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments be duly noted.

I would like to urge the reader to consider this as a brand new field per se. The present invention deals with a specific field of inversion that is notably absent in development. Most prior art in the field of inversion deals with tools to assist in the manufacture of products. Others deal with oblong finished products such as belts, ties, stockings etc. The present invention deals with gloves as finished products, the purpose of which is to provide a means to maintain healthy morbidity free hands for the users of a wide variety of thick material gloves.

Fabric inversion of all kinds have employed the use of numerous and varied tools. U.S. Patent No. 1,537,794 by Baum appears similar in structure to the present invention, however there are significant differences, especially considering the aforementioned was developed as an inherent component to and contingent upon another apparatus to perform the desired function of inverting glove fingers. Also the base of the aforementioned does not and cannot stand alone; it was specifically designed to be coupled to and applied with another entity and the apparatus is quite dissimilar, having diametrically opposite upstanding arms and a clamp at the upper end of the arms composed of laterally disposed U-shaped members and furthermore in the capacity for which it was designed, the technique employed is dissimilar; insertion; another object is inserted into it to perform its intended function contrary to the present invention, which provides a means in itself without the use of articulated and/or supplemental components.

U.S. patent # 6,568,572 to Smith is quite similar to the present invention on the surface. Even though it performs the same function as the present invention, it consists of 3 components and requires twice as many steps and requires at least twice as much time to perform the function of inverting glove appendages. Moreover it incurs an added expense to manufacture an additional component. Therefore the need exists for an improvement in the field that costs less to manufacture and is more efficient and requires less time to perform the function of inverting glove appendages. Also the present invention is lighter and more compact.

Furthermore there are significant improvements the present invention provides. The new technology of the present invention; the practically unnoticeable and unobvious configuration of the tip of the pushrod provides a means to insure continuous engagement with the tip of the glove appendages, thereby increasing efficiency and reducing the time necessary to perform the function of inverting glove appendages. Moreover, the

Appl. No. 10/790,505
Amdt. dated June 30, 2006
Office action (1st) amendment

REMARKS continued:

technique is dissimilar. U.S. Patent No. 6,568,572 employs a method of insertion: insert the tube into the glove appendage socket; subsequently insert the pushrod into the tube to invert the appendage. And U.S. Patent No. 1,537,794 also employs a method of insertion: place the glove finger over said apparatus; subsequently insert another element into said apparatus, firstly contacting the tip of the glove finger and pushing it thru said apparatus. Whereas the present invention utilizes a technology based upon a guiding principal, wherein the configuration of the tip of the pushrod provides a means to insure continuous engagement of the tip of the glove appendage thereby resulting in complete inversion by virtue of a definitive guidance procedure.

Additionally the present invention has been more than reduced to practice, it has been extensively tested and proven to operate flawlessly and as a result of the improved technology, this novel instrument performs the function for which it was designed much more efficiently and faster than any prior art in the field.

Upon due consideration of the amendments and remarks, I am sure the reader will concur that the criteria with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability have all been met.

Therefore it is submitted that patentable subject matter is clearly present. If the examiner agrees but does not feel that the present claims are technically adequate, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner write acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j).

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory J. Smith